



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/658,434	09/08/2000	Eric Schneider		2924

24226 7590 09/24/2004

ERIC SCHNEIDER  
13944 CEDAR ROAD  
# 258  
UNIVERSITY HEIGHTS, OH 44118

EXAMINER

DENNISON, JERRY B

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2143

DATE MAILED: 09/24/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

DA

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>	
	09/658,434	SCHNEIDER ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b>	<b>Art Unit</b>	
	J. Bret Dennison	2143	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 30 June 2004.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**.                      2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 33-50 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 33-50 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All    b) ☐ Some \*    c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)  | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)                                   | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)             |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____  |

### DETAILED ACTION

1. This Action is in response to Application Number 09/658,434 received on 30 June 2004.
2. Claims 33-50 are presented for examination.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 33-50 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Courter in view of obviousness.

3. Regarding claims 33, 39, 40, 41, 42, 47-49, and 50, Courter teaches a word processing method for processing text including one or more words comprising:

determining that a word of said one or more words includes an error, said word including at least one of a spelling error, grammatical error, and punctuation error (Courter, page 92, first paragraph, page 95, First paragraph, Courter teaches spell-checking and grammatical checking software that checks the spelling/grammar as you type, where the software determines if a word includes an error and if an error is found, it flags the error for the user to verify

Art Unit: 2143

correctness. After a word has been flagged, the user has the ability to correct the error by editing it); and

determining whether said word including said error is one of a uniform resource locator (URL) and fully qualified domain name (FQDN) (Courter, page 254, Courter teaches Office 2000 recognizing a web page address).

Courter also teaches the user being able to edit text by providing the user with the ability to generate a hyperlink from the error, and an interface comes up with modifiable settings, allowing the user to create the hyperlink. The user may highlight the word and from the toolbar, select insert, hyperlink. The user may then type a reference for the word and the application automatically generates a hyperlink, using the word as the label (Courter, pages 254-257, and Fig. 11.7).

Courter does not explicitly state providing a user with an ability to generate a hyperlink including said word upon or after determining that said word including said error is neither said URL nor said FQDN wherein said hyperlink includes a label and a hyperlink reference, said hyperlink reference capable of accessing a network resource.

However, Courter does teach determining that a word contains a spelling, grammar, or punctuation error, and flags the user. After flagging the user, the user has the option to change said word into a hyperlink by highlighting said word and choosing from the toolbar, Insert, hyperlink, and then a hyperlink is automatically generated for said word after the user types in a hyperlink reference.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one in the ordinary skill in the art to incorporate providing the user with the ability to generate a hyperlink from a word containing spelling, grammar, or punctuation errors to provide the user an application containing a wider range of possibilities to correct spelling, grammar, and punctuation errors.

4. Regarding claims 34-36 43, and 44, Courter teaches the limitations, substantially as claimed, as described in claims 33, 42, and 50. Courter does not explicitly state wherein words start and end with a spacebar as a delimiter. However, it would have been obvious to one in the ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to incorporate using a spacebar character as a word delimiter in a word processing document to make the document easily readable.

5. Regarding claims 37,38, 45, 46, Courter teaches the limitations, substantially as claimed, as described in claims 34 and 43. Courter does not explicitly state determining that said word includes at least one punctuation period symbol positioned between said start and end of word and further determining that said word is a fictitious domain name including a top level domain alias. However it would have been obvious to one in the ordinary skill to incorporate a punctuation period symbol in the middle of a word because having a punctuation period symbol would be considered a grammatical error.

### ***Response to Arguments***

Applicant's arguments and amendments filed on 30 June 2004 have been carefully considered but they are not deemed fully persuasive. Applicant's arguments include the failure of previously applied art to expressly disclose the teachings of providing a user with an ability to generate a hyperlink including said word upon or after determining that said word including said error is neither said URL nor said FQDN wherein said hyperlink includes a label and a hyperlink reference, said hyperlink reference capable of accessing a network resource [see Applicant's Response, filed 30 June 2004, page 5, last paragraph]. It is evident from the mappings found in the above rejection that Courter discloses the teachings of being able to generate a hyperlink from a spelling/grammar/punctuation error.

Regarding the claimed invention, Applicant only claims a method and system that determines if a word contains a spelling, grammatical, or punctuation error, and if an error is determined, enabling the user to generate a hyperlink including the word. Applicant does not disclose how the word is included in the hyperlink, whether said word is part of the network resource reference, or part of the hyperlink identifier. By Courter including a spelling, grammar, and punctuation check, as well as providing users with the ability to generate a hyperlink, Courter teaches the claimed invention substantially.

Thus, Applicant's arguments drawn toward distinction of the claimed invention and the prior art teachings on this point are not considered persuasive. It is also clear to the Examiner that Courter clearly teaches the independent claims of the Applicant's claimed invention.

Furthermore, as it is Applicant's right to continue to claim as broadly as possible their invention, it is also the Examiner's right to continue to interpret the claim language as broadly as possible. It is the Examiner's position that the detailed functionality that allows for Applicant's invention to overcome the prior art used in the rejection, fails to differentiate in detail how these features are unique. As it is extremely well known in the networking art as already shown by Courter as well as other prior arts of records disclosed, determining spelling errors in words, and being able to produce a hyperlink from a word with errors is taught as well as other claimed features of Applicant's invention. By the rejection above, the applicant must submit amendments to the claims in order to distinguish over the prior art use in the rejection that discloses different features of Applicant's claimed invention.

It is the Examiner's position that Applicant has not yet submitted claims drawn to limitations, which define the operation and apparatus of Applicant's disclosed invention in manner, which distinguishes over the prior art.

Failure for Applicant to significantly narrow definition/scope of the claims and supply arguments commensurate in scope with the claims implies the Applicant intends broad interpretation be given to the claims. The Examiner has interpreted the claims with scope parallel to the Applicant in the response and reiterates the need for the Applicant to more clearly and distinctly define the claimed invention.

### ***Conclusion***

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.


Kantrowitz et al. (U.S. Patent Number 6,618,697) discloses a method for rule-based correction of spelling and grammar errors, where spelling and grammar errors are automatically corrected wherein rules for replacing words are generated by the user.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to J. Bret Dennison whose telephone number is (703)305-8756. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8:30am-5pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, David A Wiley can be reached on (703)308-5221. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

J. Bret Dennison

  
ZARNI MAUNG  
PRIMARY EXAMINER